DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 310 SO 021 331

AUTHOR McIntosh, Peggy
TITLE Interactive Phases of Curricular and Personal Re-Vision with Regard to Race. Working Paper No. 219.
INSTITUTION Wellesley Coll., Mass. Center for Research on Women.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 21p.; For related documents, see ED 244 895 and ED 335 261-262.
AVAILABLE FROM Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, MA 02181 ($4.00 plus postage).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Culture; Black History; *Curriculum Development; Educational Theories; *History Instruction; Minority Groups; Multicultural Education; Racial Bias; *Racial Differences; Racial Relations; Social Theories

ABSTRACT

Most white, middle-class citizens see society from a monocultural perspective, a perspective that assumes, often unconsciously, that persons of all races are in the same cultural system together. This single-system form of seeing the world, is blind to its own cultural specificity. People who see persons of other races monoculturally cannot imagine the reality that those "others" think of themselves not in relation to the majority race but in terms of their own culturally specific identities. This paper presents an "interactive phase theory" with regard to race that is intended to reassess school curricula in terms of heightened levels of consciousness concerning race. In the context of U.S. history courses, five phases are presented: phase one: all-white history; phase two: exceptional minority individuals in U.S. history; phase three: minority issues, or minority groups as problems, anomalies, absences, or victims in U.S. history; phase four: the lives and cultures of people of color everywhere as history; and phase five: history redefined and reconstructed to include all people. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARGARET McINTOSH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 021 331

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Copyright © 1990 by Peggy McIntosh, Center for Research on Women,
Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181

Interactive Phases of Curricular and Personal Re-Vision with Regard to Race

Nearly 20 years ago, one afternoon in 1972, a friend on the faculty of the University of Denver was standing in the door of my office. We were talking about some aspect of race relations. My colleague said, with gentle offhandedness, "I wouldn't want to be white if you paid me five million dollars." I was startled to hear that she would not want to trade her racial identity for mine. In the previous three years, I had seen this friend survive many problems caused by systemic and personal racism. My dim awareness of, and paltry education in, just about everything pertaining to our lives made me think that hers was a racial identity not to be desired. Now I learned that I had a racial identity that she wouldn't think of wanting.[1]

My friend's candor was a gift. Her comment opened doors into areas whose distinctness I had been taught not to see: her culture and my culture. Like many people of my race and economic class, I had been taught that there was only one culture, and that we were both in it. Looking toward hers for the first time, I began to see what I had missed. I learned that my colleague would want to change her circumstances in a racist society, but not her cultural identity. I had been led to assume that her circumstances relative to mine were her cultural identity, which I thought must consist mostly of burdens. Her strong words made things more complicated, pluralized the picture, and started me doing what felt and still feels like essential Ethnic Studies homework on the elements of my friend's culture that sustained her and the elements in mine which made the idea of being "white" anathema to her.

I tell this story as a description of an awakening from what I now see as a generic state of mind trained into middle-class "white" Americans: monoculturalism, or single-system seeing. Racial or ethnic monoculturalism is the assumption that we are all in the same cultural system together, and that its outlines are those which have been recognized by people who have the most ethnic and racial power.

Single-system seeing with regard to gender takes a related form. I see it especially when men, and many women, assume that we who work in feminist movements toward alternative ways of organizing life and using power must want to do what men have done. I know a number of men who think that when we women get together, we must talk about them, or plot against them. But if one listens plurally instead of monoculturally, one will hear that women want to survive with dignity, and agency, but in general do not want to do what white Western men have done, or been asked to do.

Monoculturalism, like all forms of single-system seeing, is blind to its own cultural specificity. It cannot see itself. It mistakes its "givens" for neutral, preconceptual ground rather than for distinctive cultural grounding. People who have been granted the most public or economic power, when thinking monoculturally about "others," often imagine that these others' lives must be constituted of "issues," "problems," and deficits relative to themselves. But in fact, the politically "lesser" are, or can be, culturally central to

Copyright © 1990 by Peggy McIntosh, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181

themselves. Most will see much that is positive about their lives, through strength inherited with their traditions. Most will have learned despite and through the conditions of their lives how to behave in ways that sustain and stabilize themselves and the cultural fabrics of the world.

I write about monoculturalism and single-system seeing both as a financially secure white person in the United States who has been, within those dimensions of my identity, seen as fitting a monocultural norm, and as a woman who has been, in my gender identity, seen as culturally lesser, in Anglo-European male terms. I now know that with regard to my sex I do not simply have a deficit identity, i.e., a defective variant of male identity. Moreover, though my chosen place of work is located at the very edge of a College, we who work here call this marginal place devoted to research on women the Center. So it is with people in all cultures, I now think; we can be culturally real or central to ourselves, knowing that no one center is entitled to arbitrary dominance. And if we do not challenge the single-system seeing which projects deficit identities onto us, we will continue to be seen only as defective variants of ideal types within ruling but unacknowledged monoculture.

One great gift of my colleague's comment nearly 20 years ago was that she located herself in a position of strength and made it clear that she saw my racial group as something she would under no circumstances want to join. Within white monoculture, her position was unfamiliar; she was locating herself outside what I imagined was her status within the "one system." Her words made me begin to see my own culture as ethno-particular, ethno-specific, and in fact ethno-peculiar.

It took me some years to revise my understanding to the point at which my colleague's words came to bear very directly on the ways I taught. For like most traditionally trained "white" teachers, I needed a long time to reconceive myself before I could ground teaching in cultural pluralism. While coming around to seeing both my culture and hers in their distinctness and their interrelations, I experienced with regard to race the same slow interactive processes of re-vision which I have traced with regard to teaching about women. It is the process I described in my 1983 paper "Interactive Phases of Curricular Re-Vision: A Feminist Perspective." [2]

I review here that typology of Interactive Phases of Curricular Re-Vision, this time with a focus on race, and on processes of making curricula and personal perception more multicultural. Once again, a group of hypothetical 17-year old students appears at the end of the paper, and in this case, I write about the various kinds of understanding the "Little Women" are given with regard to Native American women and men.

In working on this account, I was reminded again that typologies are rather blunt instruments, which can be misused and misunderstood. It is important in the case of this typology of Interactive Phases to keep in mind the key adjective "interactive." Interactive ways of seeing coexist in dynamic interrelation. Varieties of awareness are within us; we are not fixed within them. For this reason, it is a mistake to use the typology of Interactive Phases to label, type, or critique individual persons, as though they were fixed forever in one or another form of awareness, or as though we could pass

from one to another form of awareness forever. Plural ways of seeing contextualize but do not simply erase single-system understandings. When we widen our ways of knowing, we cannot simply not leave previous ways of knowing behind, nor the understandings they gave us. We can become aware of the cultural particularity and the societal consequences of various ways of knowing, seeing, or being.

At their best, typologies create frameworks within which we can understand frequently observed phenomena which at first were not seen to be in coherent relation to each other. The theory of Interactive Phases of Curricular and Personal Re-Vision has spoken to some readers about their own and others' efforts to put academic understandings on a broader and more humane base. For some readers, the phase theory illuminates the evolution of a discipline, a department, an idea, or an institution. For some it has been a tool for evaluation or assessment of curriculum in general, individual course syllabi, or assignments. For many it has been useful in describing, inspiring, and justifying shifts in teaching methods. It has been applied by me and others to analysis of patterns in management, leadership, government, science, social and economic policy, education and interpersonal behavior. It has illuminated for many individuals their own changing thoughts and practises in educational settings and beyond.

At the outset of this discussion of interactive phase theory in terms of race, I want to mention three matters which often need to be clarified in faculty development discussions of curriculum change along lines of race. First, to repeat what I have already said, all people have racial and ethnic identities. Each "white" person has a racial and an ethnic background; there is no culturally unmarked person. Second, each person brings to his or her life the influences of a particular complex of circumstances. For example, my academic writing, including this piece, bears the marks of my own experience as a Caucasian woman who has worked in several private and wealthy sectors of American society, and who has both resisted some of their norms and at the same time internalized and benefited from their powers. Third, as I have suggested, when "whites" look at "race" only under the rubric of "others" and "issues," this is a sign of monocultural and single-system seeing, which is culturally controlling. All people have racial identities, and people in all racial groups have more to their lives than their "issues" relative to dominant groups. Academic work in broadening racial or ethnic understanding is ineffectual if it doesn't result in shifts of sensibility such as my colleague's comment produced for me, shifts into pluralized awareness. Ethnic Studies reinforces white dominance and Women's Studies reinforces male dominance if they measure by previous norms rather than recognizing distinct be-ing in people of all groups and all circumstances.

My discussion of phase theory and race needs one further prefatory comment: work in developing racial awareness ought to produce greater awareness of gender relations as well. As we begin to work on curricular and personal re-vision, however, "white" people often reflect previous miseducation by speaking as though race and sex are wholly separate factors of people's experience. In the monocultural, vertical worlds of either/or thinking one can't think of both <u>at once</u>. For in a white male monocultural frame of reference, whatever isn't the norm is cast as a separate and different form of anomaly. In discussing the first three interactive phases of curricular and personal re-vision here, I

will keep sex and race "issues" separate as if it were indeed possible to focus on race without seeing intersecting conditions of experience which impinge on racial experience. But in Phase IV, one sees that sex and race are not separate "issues, and that the commonly used phrase "women and minorities" serves monocultural ends while having no more logic than the phrase "parents and men," or "Chinese and men," since "women" are comprised of people in every cultural group, and half of every racial and ethnic group is female. People of color and "white" women constitute a substantial majority in the U.S., while our present monoculture overentitles a "white" male minority. As long as monoculture's racial and gender outlines are unrecognized, it will be able to project separate problematical status by race and sex on those it does not entitle, and thus keep the actual majority conceptually divided against itself, not knowing in any politically usable way what is happening.

My 1983 typology of Interactive Phases of Curricular and Personal Re-vision derived from work with college faculty members to bring into the liberal arts curriculum new materials and perspectives from Women's Studies. I saw that in the early 1980's, traditionally trained white faculty members in History, for example, were likely to move from Phase One: Womanless History, to Phase Two: Women in History, on its terms. Both kinds of thinking are challenged by what I identified as Phase Three: Women as a Problem, Anomaly, or Absence in History. I meant "in History" in two senses: in the past, and in History's telling of the past. Phase Three involves and requires more anger and critique than either of the first two, but can get arrested in victim-studies. It can also lead constructively to a potent wordlessness and to a daring plunge into the moving, grounded, humble, and plural inquiry of Phase Four: Women's Lives <u>As</u> History, looking toward Phase Five: History Reconstructed and Redefined to Include Us All, which I said would take us 100 years to conceive.

After observing traditionally-trained faculty in all academic fields over the last eleven years, I think that the schema can be applied to the processes of faculty growth and development in all of them, even the so-called hard sciences. Teachers in any field are likely to begin teaching chiefly in what I termed Phase One: Womanless Scholarship or Science, with perhaps a little attention to Phase Two: Women in Scholarship or Science, but only on the existing terms. There may follow, if the faculty member has been keeping up with scholarship on women, and is not too defensive about what it reveals, some teaching along lines of Phase Three: Women as a Problem, Anomaly, Absence, or victim in and of the Scholarship or Science. Phase Four teaching and inquiry dares put what was neglected or marginal at the center, to see what new insight or theory can be developed from hitherto excluded or overlooked sources whose absence helped to determine the shape of each field. It can be called Experienced-based Scholarship and Science; it goes far beyond the exceptional achievements allowed in Phase Two and the discussion of "issues" allowed in Phase Three. Always the dynamic interactions among the phases suggest the making of new knowledge, the making of Phase Five: Scholarship and Science Redefined and Reconstructed to Include Us All.

As I have said, no one person or course exists in complete fixity in a given phase, and the phases I describe do not always occur in the chronological order given. Some of those who are born either within or outside of dominant groups may have been

immersed since childhood in awareness of the "issues" of Phase Three, or in the relational alertness and the plural consciousness which I attribute to Phase Four. Most traditionally trained white faculty members, however, started teaching within the framework of Phase One mono-culturalism, oblivious of the racial and gender elements they were immersed in. Some have moved on to think in rather predictable Phase Two ways about how to get more overlooked individuals (for at first it is seen only as a matter of overlooked individuals) into the essentially single-system version of reality which is handed on to students and is not, within monoculture, acknowledged as a version at all. One sees often in sequence the dawning realizations and syllabus changes which I identify as belonging to Phases Two, Three, and Four of consciousness.

When one considers Interactive Phase Theory with regard to race, an obvious curricular example to begin with is the U. S. History course required of all students in high school or college, or both. This course is not usually liked by students. Though it is required of all students at some point, it seems not to provide them with a sense that they are in History as voters-to-be or active makers of political policy. As it undergoes revision in the hands of teachers and textbook authors who hope to make it more representative and engaging, it usually follows predictable patterns with regard to race.

Phase One: All-White History is followed by Phase Two: Exceptional Minority Individuals in U.S. History, which leads to Phase Three: Minority Issues, or Minority Groups as Problems, Anomalies, Absences, or Victims in U.S. History. Then may come a rare and important conceptual shift to Phase Four: The Lives and Cultures of People of Color Everywhere <u>As</u> History. I think such courses, if they survive at all, will move toward an eventual Phase Five: History Redefined and Reconstructed to Include Us All.

A Phase One all-white course in U.S. History usually begins by describing the voyages of Europeans, and this entry point does not bring any challenges from students. A Phase Two course will encourage students of color to emulate the most "ambitious" of their forbears, and overcome obstacles to advancement in American society. In the case of Native Americans, there may be an emphasis on those who are seen to have interacted well with the "settlers." Phase Three courses focus on, or at least give serious attention to, racism and other systemic oppressions. In the case of Native peoples, the late 19th century U. S. government policy of genocide is recognized. Phase Four is entirely different, imaginatively honoring a variety of cultures on their own terms, trying to see them through the testimony or actions of their people. For example, teaching in this mode goes far beyond Indian "issues" to Indian cultures; it suggests the wholeness and intricacy of Native cosmologies, and the Indians' particular relation to the land and consonance with the spirit in the land, before the Anglo-European ethos of land ownership was imposed. Phase Four recognizes Anglo-European ideas, actions, and standards as ethno-specific. Phase Five will require a vocabulary for perceiving, feeling, and analyzing which is both plural and coherent, and will put us in a new relation to ourselves and the world.

My original analysis of Interactive Phases Of Curricular Re-Vision was placed in context of, and diagrammatically overlaid upon, my theoretical model of double structures within both psyche and society in the industrialized West: overvalued,

overdeveloped, "vertical," competitive functions at odds with undervalued, underrecognized, "lateral" collaborative functions. The shape of the whole is that of a faulted pyramid or mountain range with a vertical "grain" in the higher rocks and a horizontal "grain" in the rock of the substructure.

Phases One, Two, and Three, all on a vertical axis, focus respectively on the top, middle, and bottom of the pyramidally-shaped competitive functions of psyche and society. Phase One: Exclusive History focuses on the functions of controlling, ordering, subduing, or prevailing. It tends to emphasize laws, wars, contests, or management of systems, and to tell the stories of winners, at the tops of the ladders of so-called success, accomplishment, achievement, and excellence. A little lower on the ladders comes the Phase Two: the Exceptions History of "ambitious" Others. Then at the bottom of the win-lose vertical territory comes the Issues-oriented History of the losers, and struggling but often defeated fighters.

Phase Four gives us the lateral valleys and plains below the geological fault-line. This is the territory of the sustaining fields and the cyclical growing and harvesting of food. This is the territory of repetitive upkeep and maintenance, the daily making and mending of the social, material, intellectual, and spiritual fabrics, without which the climbing work within vertical structures of psyche and society is not possible. To observe the lateral world is to observe most of inner and outer life, quite beyond what the formal academy has sanctioned as worthy of study. I think the lateral world corresponds to what Paul Tillich has called "the ground of our being." Phase Four provides Experience-based History, which recognizes and strengthens fabrics and interconnections and knowledge of the multiplicities of self. Phase Five will give us Reconstructed Global and Biological History to Survive By. The present histories of conflict which implicitly underlie all of the disciplines are not histories we can survive by, in an age when we must learn to connect or re-connect, for our survival.

Phases One, Two and Three teach monocultural modes of dominance and defense, and educate the wary and controlling self; Phase Four fosters the making of what I have proposed we should call <u>the contingent self</u>, and the responsive society. Phases One, Two and Three can only see in terms of the "top" and the "bottom;" Phase Four looks to the far vaster and sustaining lateral habitat, and to the mystery of how connections, communities, and vulnerable growing things are best fostered. The hidden ethos hanging over Phases One, Two, and Three is competitive and has an either/or axis: "You win lest you lose; kill or be killed." The hidden ethos of Phase Four is collaborative and has a both/and feel: "You work for the decent survival of all, for therein lies your own best chance for survival."

Phase One consciousness involves identification with publicly powerful "white" Western males. In this phase, "whites" neither study people of color nor notice that they have not. The obliviousness of single-system seeing is a hallmark of this phase. The Phase Two remedy admits a few "minorities" to History, but only on History's terms, still without any relectiveness on the racial history of those traditional terms and definitions. Phase Three takes us into "race issues. It identifies "race" monoculturally, ascribing race only to people of color, and sees people of color only in the category of Problem,

identifying whole groups of people chiefly with losers' "issues" rather than with human life experienced fully. Doing work only in Phase Three can be inadvertently racist or sexist, for it is a cultural insult to any group to imply that its main feature is what I have called above a deficit identity. Phase Three never does a full analysis of the psyche or peculiarity of the "oppressor." The oppressed group is set up to look powerless and defective by contrast with the more powerful group, which is seen as the norm, and not examined for its cultural specificity, peculiarity, or pathology. Still, Phase Three at least encourages students to recognize the existence of invisible systems of power and disadvantage.

Phase Four comes out of and recognizes the lateral, connected, and diverse functions of psyche and society; it is about creativity, integrity, wholeness, ordinariness, and multiple forms of power and talent unrecognized in vertical systems of appraisal. It honors both/and thinking about who exists and what counts. Without it, we will not be able to make sense of the world nor policy for our survival. Phase Four reveals us, in LeRoy Moore's language, as "bodies in the body of the world," and as distinctly different from each other, not measurable against one standard, and indeed not hewing to one, any more than the biological forms of life on the planet belong to one type.

Phase Four can be healing. But Phase Four unattached to the issues-awareness of Phase Three can be sentimental. It may be a celebration of diversity as if there were no politics which had prevented, and keeps working against, such celebration. If teachers lapse into Phase Four while forgetting about vertical power structures, they may become romantic, and not face the pain which systems of subjection inflict. For example, while honoring the strengths of African-American culture as Toni Morrison may describe them, I need to keep in mind the contexts that produced these strengths. My ancestors on one side were slave-owners. This fact bears on the conventions and particularities of many aspects of Morrison's culture and of mine. Only it bears differently on each.

Though Phase Four without Phase Three awareness can be naive, Phase Four has potential reconstitutive power for all students and teachers. For an enormous shift in the consciousness occurs when the ordinary lives of people, including people of color as the world's majority, are seen to constitute the main human story, and history is defined as all of those elements of the past in the multiplicities of our heritages which can make each of us feel fully real in the context of education or life. In Phase Four, the question of "How was it for people?" opens the study of History to every kind of humble detail. All voices count. Pedagogy shifts so that the professor's forms of knowing are not necessarily superior to the students' forms of knowing. The elements of Phase One are not obliterated, but take a new place in the picture. Someone has said that if you study the experience of an escaped slave woman in Boston in the 1850's you will find Lincoln, but if you start with Lincoln, you will not necessarily get to the experience of any slave. Phase Four stays very close to the ground of daily human experience, and asks many questions of people about their lives, listening for many human voices, and examining the cultural and political specificity of frameworks for collecting and evaluating information. All experience is seen as a source of knowledge.

My previous paper provided brief examples of Phase Four teaching with regard to both race and gender in the disciplines of Literature, Psychology, Biology, and Art. I concluded by saying that I saw the work toward Phase Five as taking one hundred years because it involves a reconstruction of consciousness, perception and behavior. It will very likely attempt to create, and then maintain, public awareness that we must, locally and globally, value life more than conflict, and attend to the processes of maintaining life. I think we cannot at this time even imagine the categories within which we will collect information for plural Phase Five understandings and reconstructions of education. Most "educated" minds seem terribly stuck in narrow frameworks leading to personal anxiety, and accepting of social repression, turmoil, and global danger. But if our descendants work at Phase Five, they will probably find many fugitive precedents for their work in the perplexed and tentative legacies we leave now.

With regard to race in the undergraduate curriculum, most of our universities still feature Phase One introductory courses in virtually all departments. These courses feature the thought and research of Anglo-European-American scholars, i.e. "white" forefathers in the making of knowledge. The courses feature winners in law, war, or trade; the getting and holding of literal or conceptual territory; the making of frameworks for understanding; the wresting of "order" from "chaos"; the development of cultural traditions from nothingness or from "primitive" originals. In such courses, one may study people of color like Egyptians under the impression that they are really "white." In monocultural, single-system courses, students of all races are asked to imagine that the essential insights into human thought, labor, imagination, and care can all be found in the study of Caucasian people.

My generalizations may bring objections from some who say that the introductory level college curriculum is now overstretched through inclusion of new materials on "race and class." This is an illusion. The fact is that no works by people of color are seen as central to understanding any of the traditional liberal arts disciplines, and people of color are presented chiefly as disadvantaged, or as primitive forbears of real civilization, or as recent immigrants with cultural traditions that create problems for "America." Moreover, there is very little material of any kind by and about non-Western majorities in most college and school students' courses.

If readers doubt this, they should examine the introductory-level course reading lists of their own institutions. "White" teachers should imagine themselves as students of color, for example as Asian-American students, trying to find their people reflected as valid in basic readings. Most courses are still monocultural, even Anthropology, in which teachers focus on the thinking of "white," mostly male, anthropologists. This gives "white" students the impression that there is one main piece of cultural turf and it is their turf. The students of color, like the "white" women, are implicitly shown they have not been necessary to knowledge, enterprise, and past culture-making, nor are they essential to future cultural invention or reclamation. In such courses, oral traditions are seen to count for nothing at all; argumentative written traditions, though very culture- and gender-specific in origin, inform most of the "objective" texts and all of the assignments. Historiography courses, much touted for their plural, comparative sophistication, focus on "white" men.

Phase Two courses bring in a few famous or notable people of color but do not challenge the traditional outlines and definitions of what is worth studying. Therefore the emphasis continues to be on "firsts," laws, wars, winners, talented individuals, fighters, and those who nearly matched what is taken to be "white" male achievement. People of color who succeeded in getting and holding onto some kinds of social, political, or artistic territory are seen as possibly worth studying. But often those who are noticed in Phase Two courses are represented as having gone far but not irrationally far in challenging existing "white," male, or colonial frameworks, and therefore are seen as being worth noticing: Sacajawea, Sequoyah, Black Elk, Douglass, Baldwin, King, Walker, Morrison. Usually, Latinos and Asian-Americans do not get into Phase Two courses at all; recent and rare exceptions are Maxine Hong Kingston, Yoko Ono, and Cesar Chavez. Those who most strongly rebelled against "white" dominance are usually annihilated in the telling of history as they were in life. Those who accommodated or assimilated somewhat may become cultural heroes, especially in retrospect; they may come to be seen as almost within the "mainstream."

In Phase Two, teaching about people of color as exceptional and therefore worthy of notice, can create psychological problems. Many teachers think that in holding up "exceptions," they are providing role models for students of color, and demonstrating to "white" students that people of color should be taken seriously. The impulse can be genuine, and a fairly wealthy "white" person like myself should take care not to dismiss models of "success" for students who may be feeling desperate and continually put down. It is easy to critique prevailing definitions of success from a position of economic security. Still, the Phase Two-Famous Few curriculum can be damaging, as it may deliver to students of color the message that most of their people are not worth studying, and that if they become <u>unlike</u> their people, they may be worthy of notice. It may serve as a bribe: leave your people and you may rise up the "real life" ladders from the bottom to become an American hero. Phase Two can put students at psychological risk, encouraging them to make their way not as members of their ethnic group but as soloists.

Elizabeth Minnich has pointed out that this loner status makes a person from a nondominant group vulnerable to every setback. Once the loner goes through the gates alone, refusing to identify with her or his stigmatized group, then every setback must seem like something which has been caused by personal behavior or is at some level merited.

A second psychological danger to students of Phase Two-Famous Few teaching is the implication that if are "really good," you will not be seen as African-American, Latino, Asian-American, or Native-American, but only "as a person." We women are sometimes taught that we will be seen as persons, if we will just forget that we are women. No; we will be seen as having sex and race and ethnic identity, especially if we are female or dark-skinned, or have features identified with a cultural sub-group. It is mere illusion to imagine that American adults see anyone as "just a person"; our "educational" and media training in type-casting, hierarchical placing, and mistrust has been too strong. Phase Two success stories of "achievers" imply to students that all they

need to do to get out of their debilitating circumstances is to work a little harder and "make it on their own," without complaint, and without ties to their (impaired) people.

One further problem with Phase Two teaching is that the singling out of cultural heroes misrepresents the values of cultures in which the making of the individual hero is not thought of as possible or desirable. Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman were working for and with their people, yet are featured as outstanding individuals. Often collaborative group work is not seen to exist. The chief poster for the UN Decade for Women 1985 conference in Nairobi features a single woman weaving a basket. Women weave baskets together in Kenya; it is a group activity. In order to create the poster the designer had to misrepresent the culture. Phase Two courses featuring a famous few who stand out "above the crowd" can grossly misrepresent Asian-American, Native-American, and Latino cultures in which the star system is not the norm. American baseball players in Japan today have said, "The Japanese play for ties; no team and no player should get too far ahead." Asian-American youngsters who do very well in the American school system may be doing so not for stardom but as a reflection of other cultural values, for example duty, obedience, or honor, a cultural ideal poorly understood by North Americans who do not have Asian ancestry.

The shift to Phase Three usually comes when teachers realize that Phase Two is politically naive: it features a few who survived in society but gives little attention to the structures of power in society. An important emotional shift occurs when teachers look past individual lives and experiences to invisible hierarchical systems which have very strong predictive power for the general outlines of any given life. Most teachers in the United States were not educated in school to see these systems at work, but were taught that the individual is the main unit of society and that the U.S. system is a meritocracy. It is a sign of personal growth when teachers begin to pass on to students systemic awareness of social inequities in resources, opportunities, and access to public power.

Phase Three, then, focuses on racism, classism, sexism, struggle, overt violence, persecution, persistence, protest, and work toward new policies and laws. Especially in the field of social history, the emphasis is on those who fought for change which would benefit oppressed people. Phase Three usefully focuses on interlocking oppressions, and at its best it links the study of power within the United States to power world-wide, so that students can see how patterns of colonialism, imperialism, and genocide outside of the U.S. match patterns of domination, militarism and genocide at home. All teachers and students in the United States need this experience of asking who has the most power, and why, and how it is used, and what is going on.

But Phase III has its weaknesses. Many white social historians think they are studying multiculturally when in fact they are merely studying protest movements monoculturally. All the protestors look more or less the same. Phase Three scholarship never asks "ordinary" people about their lives, never takes children, women, or servants as authorities, never listens to voices which the academic world has not yet respected.

Phase Three, then, like Phase Two, opens some doors and keeps others shut. Its main conceptual fault is that it keeps the powers of definition and evaluation in the

hands of the present "authorities," within a single system of meaning and value defined monoculturally. We will never make most people's experience seem either real or valid if our teaching and research still rest on the kinds of credentialling and vertical appraisal derived from the experience of those who have had the most power. Just as Phase Two analyses of "Black achievement" rarely encompass one chief achievement of African-Americans, which is to have survived and endured with dignity, Phase Three tends to focus on visible political deficits without acknowledging any political dimension in focusing on "deficits" to begin with. The analysis of others' "issues" does not prepare Caucasian people to look at their own psyches, or to learn from "others."

I have noticed that many or most of us in the "white" academic world are more comfortable discussing issues of disempowerment than taking seriously those lives which do not center on, depend on, or resist "white" male governance, and which embody alternative forms of power. As I have said, Phase Three attributes to whole groups deficit identities, while denying their cultural identities, and in doing so it maintains control for the dominant group. It sets up a dominant paradigm in the mind of the student and then allows the underdog to be seen only as challenging it. It says to students of color, "You can be a fighter," not "You are a maker of culture and of life." It says to "white" students, "You are high; others are low." Such monocultural teaching about racism may ironically increase arrogance or ignorance in "white" students. It may teach them to sympathize with, or even admire the struggles of people of color but it will not teach that "winners" have anything to learn from "losers," except perhaps how to fight. Its lenses are useless for clarifying my colleague's comment that she would not want to be white.

Phase Four, on the other hand, illuminates her comment. For Phase Four makes a crucial shift to a lateral, plural frame of reference beyond winning and losing. It produces courses in which we are all seen to be in it together, all having ethnic and racial identity, all having culture, all placed by birth in particular social and political circumstances, all with some power to say no, and yes, and "This I create"; all with voices to be heard, all damaged, and all in need of healing, all real, very distinctively ourselves, potential makers of new theories and new understandings of life. When I say "all damaged," I am thinking of the fact that my slave-holding ancesters were damaged. They were not damaged in the same ways that their slaves were, but they were made cruel and sick by their roles. Phase Four, being a frame of mind that goes beyond monoculturalism to cultural pluralism, allows me to see this. It opens the doors that my friend opened for me, onto my own culture newly realized by me as a culture, and onto hers, formed on a different base of experience. Phase Four suggests multiple worlds, or in the words of the Pueblo Indian Gregory Cajete, it suggests Multiversal Realities, rather than a single Universe.

Phase Four reading lists in any discipline often contain multiple short works or kinds of material, including work by students, and provide multiple insights on any situation, in several media, with a de-emphasis on "issues" of disempowerment and a more unusual emphasis on cultural detail, and voices from daily life. Phase Four classes can be wondrous in their energy, interest, and healing power. Students feel co-ownership of them, and sometimes experience such courses as life-lines. It is true that

competitiveness, anxiety, and vertical stereotyping from the conventional types of teaching carry over into the work of Phase Four classes, but teachers creating laterally expanded and culturally explicit syllabi usually try to redistribute power more evenly than usual in a classroom, and to weaken privilege systems which interfere with listening to many voices, and respecting testimony from many sources.

Whereas Phase III emphasizes differences from an assumed but unexamined norm, and Phase IV recognizes distinctiveness without accepting any norm; it recognizes in experience the equivalent of what Gerard Manley Hopkins named as the "inscape" of created things -- particular and vivid internal distinctness.

Some time ago I wrote a paper which lists 46 ways in which I daily experience having "white" skin privilege relative to my African-American colleagues in the same building.[3] This is a Phase Four analysis. The paper rests on my sense of ethno-particularity, ethno-specificity, and ethno-pecularity with regard to unearned advantage in my workplace. "White" skin privilege is invisible in the Phase Three monocultural focus on "others'" issues and deficits. I could see the cultural circumstance of having unearned over-advantage and its attendant cultural deformities only within the multi-cultural framework of Phase Four, in which my racial group is not assumed to embody a neutral or desirable norm.

Phase Four understandings take some blame out of the description of dominant groups; all people are seen as born into circumstances they did not ask for and systems they did not invent. The processes at work in Phase IV include listening, observing, making connections, respecting many kinds of life, power, and thought, including one's own, and imagining how to institutionalize the protection of diverse forms of life including distinct forms of human community.

Phase Five is needed to help us to an as-yet-unthinkable reconciliation between our competitive, hierarchical propensities and our contingent and relational propensities. Phase Four education helps to develop and reward the capacity for being in relation to others; Phase Five will need to help us also to rethink organizational structures in complex worlds where distribution of resources, services, and basic supports requires balanced uses of vertical and lateral abilities.

For this reason, as I imagine Phase Five, my diagrammatic model of psychic and societal structures turns into a large, three-dimensional globe. The faulted pyramids, with their bedrock lateral functions underlying the vertical functions, become simply one element in the topology of each continent, in a world like our own in which mountain ranges are one of the forms of geography. Each continent, each group of cultures, has its ranges, its "peaks," its dynasties, but mountain climbing is understood to be one particular human activity, not the only human activity. Sending expeditions to climb very high mountains requires preparation, equipment, freeze-dried food, support systems, base camps, porters, sponsorship, and people who can bow out of other life-sustaining activities or responsibilities. Certain maps can be drawn from high summits only. Many useful maps can never be drawn from summits at all. In any case, high summits do not support most forms of life. They are deoxygenated, and it is well known that people on

too little oxygen do not make very wise decisions about the welfare of themselves or others.

It is the foothills, valleys, and alluvial plains which support life best, with rainfall, fertile soil, and concentrations of human knowledge about growing and harvesting. And at the edge of the water as we can learn to farm the sea as well. For the last 40 years, we in the U.S. have, figuratively speaking, taught that mountain climbing is the worthiest activity, the mark of ambition and of success. To shift to metaphors of making and mending the fabrics of culture and environment seems to me to make more sense now. We can also usefully teach metaphors of journeying. Many of our students in the U.S. are free to travel, metaphorically speaking, to many sites in the topology, to experience many varieties of life, on many figurative continents. Some will stay in single locations throughout a lifetime. But we will continue to suffer if educators keep teaching that mountain climbing and peak experience are the best activities, and that the resources of the society are well spent operating base camps which help a few people or nations to stand briefly on summits and feel they have prevailed over life or each other.

The metaphysical shift from a faulted pyramid to a globe in which peaks and valleys are parts of cultural topology is accompanied by a further conceptual shift. The multicultural globe is interior as well as exterior; the multicultural worlds are in us as well as around us. Early cultural conditioning trained each of us as children to shut off awareness of certain groups, voices, abilities, and inclinations, including the inclination to be with many kinds of children. Continents we might have known were closed off or subordinated within us. The domains of personality that remain can and do fill the conceptual space like colonizing powers. But a potential for pluralized understanding remains in us; the moves toward reflective consciousness come in part from almost-silenced continents within ourselves. Greater diversity of curriculum reflects not just the exterior multicultural world but the interior self which in early childhood was aware of, and attuned to, many varieties of experience.

Readers of my 1983 paper on phase theory will know that I matched the phases with the sensibilities of hypothetical first-year college students called Meg, Amy, Jo, and Jo's twin daughters, Maya and Angela, and their younger sister Adrienne. I wished to indicate that what and how we teach in each of these frames of reference actually has life outcomes for students. This is true for the various ways we teach Ethnic Studies. I cannot guess about the effects on students of color of Phases One, Two, and Three, but I will sketch some portraits of the ways in which I have seen instruction in these phases affect the development of Anglo-European-American students, and then suggest the consonance between Maya and Angela's lives and Phase Four curriculum. My focus here is on the various kinds of understanding which the "Little Women" are given with regard to Native American culture.

Meg, who is a casualty of a Phase One curriculum, is a white girl who tries very hard to be good. She wants to be "sugar and spice," and also to be kind. When she is growing up, her brother plays Cowboys and Indians every afternoon with his friends in the neighborhood. She watches shows on cowboys and Indians. She learns in elementary school that the "settlers" had to contend with many "dangers of the

wilderness," which included Indians and wild animals. She learns in high school that the settlers had to protect their families from Indians, who took scalps. In four years of college, she reads one chapter on "The North American Indian," which cites 12 white male anthropologists, refers to nearly 300 tribes and hundreds of language groups, yet does not make Indians seem the slightest bit real to her. This is Phase One Ethnic Studies in which "white" people neither study people of color nor notice that they haven't. Meg has studied "white" anthropologists. During her years in college, Meg will never start a conversation with a student of color. The way they "band together" makes her nervous. She seeks her friends, for safety. Meg will marry young, feeling a need of protection from many perceived dangers. She will marry a "white" man who turns out later to be neither a settler nor a protector. Many years later, as a a Continuing Education student, Meg will find herself in another college course, reading for the very first time the words of a Native American. She reads Black Elk Speaks, and she is in tears. The sacred hoop is broken. Meg is devastated to discover the wholeness of Indian worlds just at the same time that she learns of their near destruction.

Amy, the ambitious art student schooled in Phase Two, appraises Indian work casually, as well as competitively. She knows it is only "craft," not Art, but feels the need to find grounds for putting it down. She finds it repetitive, primitive, inexpressive, and of course merely functional. Amy thinks some of the rugs and pots are handsome, and she is sure that she would recognize the work of a first-rate Indian artist, if only these people would put away their talk about broken treaties, and transcend their "cause." Amy cannot understand why they keep repeating old stories of their traditions, instead of joining what she thinks of as the cultural mainstream. She feels no curiosity about Indians, but gives a silent cheer when she hears that Wilma Mankiller has become Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation. "That's the way it should done," she thinks. "Just go for it and don't let anything get in your way." The idea that Wilma Mankiller was chosen because of her consonance with, rather than her competition against, others in her nation does not occur to Amy, who has been deeply dyed in the tradition of "the individual versus society." Amy takes a passing interest in Curtis's photographs of Indians, for their strong and striking faces. She feels, however, that if these people were "really good," they would have prevailed. She cannot imagine a culture in which the aim is not to prevail. As a gallery owner in middle age, Amy is criticized for her failure to show works by artists of color. She says that she would show some if she could find a truly outstanding artist. Her mind is as open as the "exceptions" curriculum of Phase Two can make it.

Jo, the older "white" woman who comes to college out of a failed marriage at the age of 40, is appalled by what she learns in her course on Gender, Race, and Class in American society. She had never understood why the Indians disappeared; she had known nothing of the slaughter of the buffalo, which took away the Plains Indians' means of existence, the Trail of Tears which killed tens of thousands of Cherokees and deprived most of the Nation of its native habitat, or the outlawing of Indian languages, laws and rituals. She sees in the silencing and crippling and betrayal of the Indians the same kinds of systemic oppression she has felt as a woman, silenced, dispossessed, beaten and battered in a marriage which now feels to her like a broken treaty. She is outraged that the books in which "white" anthropologists speak about Indian

demographics do not make Indians' sufferings come alive. She writes a history paper on the way in which "whites" have named as "great" Indians only those who met Europeans halfway, but she does not know what to say about the corrective except that the American historians should recognize the fiercest fighters more honestly, and make the betrayals by European-Americans clearer. Jo is distressed by this paper as she hands it in; something is missing, but she does not know what.

After the class ends, Jo starts a correspondence with an Indian woman in prison whose name she has found in an anthology of writing by North American Indians. As this correspondence goes on, she begins a support group for imprisoned Indian women, in order to raise money for their legal expenses and their families, and to provide them with reading and writing materials. Jo feels that she is at the edge of a vast territory about which she is wholly ignorant, and is angered to see in retrospect that the book she read on United States Women's History in a Women's Studies course did not contain a single mention of Native American women. She wonders whether she shouldn't have majored in Ethnic Studies rather than having to find out about Indians in this roundabout way. She can't seem to get people in her field, Women's Studies, interested in Native Americans. She persuades the Student Union Committee to show the film "Broken Treaty at Battle Mountain." She thinks of her work for Indians as being <u>for them</u>, but not for herself.

Maya and Angela, Jo's twin children, are attached both through schooling and through life outside of school to both their Anglo-American and their African-American cultural roots. Whereas the "white" feminists they meet often talk about inventing new forms beyond patriarchy, they think of their "black" culture as both prepatriarchal and nonpatriarchal, and assume that it is these cultural traditions which need to be reclaimed in order to make the world a saner place. They own a cassette of the television interview in which Bill Moyers asks Louise Erdrich how Indian values can survive in this world of individuality, competition, and technology. Erdrich asks how the world can possible survive <u>without</u> Indian values, saying that it has come to the brink of ecological crisis without them. The twins also like Michael Dorris's account of the mailman who came to his door asking him how to run an all-Iroquois week for a group of Cub Scouts in the woods. Dorris laughs and says that the most important thing was to take these boys' mothers, because Iroquois boys wouldn't possibly know how to get along in the woods without their mothers to teach them.

Maya and Angela are of course aware of Indian persecution, but they share Beth Brant's feeling that they are not victims; they are "organizers, freedom fighters, feminists, healers, and ... none of this is new; it has been true for centuries." They like their own laughter, their powers of spirit, <u>their identities</u>. They would not like to trade their identities for anyone else's. They feel affinities with Native Americans, with many other men and women of color, and with the few "white" feminist women and men who have made common cause with them. Their mother wants to talk about Indian Issues with the Cherokee friend whom they bring home for a meal. Maya and Angela have to explain why their friend did not make eye contact and did not respond warmly to this subject. They explain that her lack of eye contact is a mark of respect, and that her manner reflects Tsalagi cultural values of patience, respect for age, personal caution,

listening and observing, making criticism indirectly, and keeping the emphasis on the whole group.

Maya and Angela see themselves as coming from different Nations than Indians, with heritages of different stories, but feel that they are similarly guided by spirits, and they have deep attachments to the "black" community. In their identification with darkness, they find nurturance. They do not study Indians so much as to derive strength from them; Carol Lee Sanchez, Joy Harjo, Beth Brant, Marilou Awiakta, Bea Medicine, Brenda Collins, Linda Hogan. They feel connected to their ancestors, to the invisible world, and to birds, trees, earth and sky.

Maya and Angela write on Native American cultures in college term papers; Maya writes on Mother Earth and Grandmother Earth, describing the distinction between Mother Earth, who brings forth trees and corn, and Grandmother Earth, who appears in some Indian cosmologies as the growing principle itself. She contrasts Plato's view of the defects of the accidental or merely actual, as against the pureness of pure Form, with the Indian view that Mother Earth's products are not defective reductions of any purer principle. Angela, in a Phase Four Education course, writes a primer for grade school children, explaining that the Indians were the settlers, and illustrating elements of the wholeness and integrity of their lives, before the European invaders arrived. It is no surprise when several years after their leaving college, these women are adopted into one of the clans of the Cherokee Nation, and continue various forms of teaching and learning on the Cherokee theme that we are all part of the human circle.

Adrienne, their younger sister, is trying to help work on the curriculum toward survival. She dreams of balance between the creatures of the earth and their habitats, and she dreams of balance among nations and individuals so that all may survive with dignity. She is rather abstracted and preoccupied, and is working toward metaphors for the new texts which might sustain us.

Maya, Angela, and Adrienne have refused to accept the projections onto them of deficit identity by the dominant culture. Though my description of them may sound simple and even halcyon, they are doing heroic work in refusing monocultural messages about what they are. Their affirmation of their wholeness and their will to connect rather than sever themselves from others is a hard-won sanity which could cost them very heavily. They may be seen as unnatural, neurotic, unambitious, devious, secretive, out of touch with the "realities" of modern civilization, non-professional, unable to "progress." They may be seen as enemies of the government, and vilified both subtly and obviously by those who have the most cultural power. Ethnic Studies and Women's Studies can strengthen their hand if taught not only with a focus on aspiration (Phase Two) or understanding of systemic oppressions (Phase Three), but also with respect for and reinforcement for their personal and cultural integrity. Mending the sacred hoop is dangerous political work, but it is work toward survival. When Women's Studies makes common cause with the Ethnic Studies to put human dignity and integrity at the center, then both will be doing their most dangerous and healing work.

It is significant that Meg, Amy, and Jo never receive a version of curriculum that goes much beyond the boundaries of the United States. Maya and Angela, on the other hand, have been supported to think beyond national boundaries, recognizing people everywhere, and seeing the earth and the sky as more basic organizers of human life than local governments. They have cross-cultural curiosity and commitment, trusting their own daily experience to lead to questions about larger world patterns. It is as though they have mentally signed a treaty of peace with others across national boundaries, regardless of what national leaders allow or want. They think of people in cultures other than their own as having cultural complexity and integrity, and as being unknown to them, but potentially in conversation with them. They feel a strong need to find common bonds and make some common policy amidst the diversities. Differences in governing bodies and strategies are not to them any indicator of final separateness; instead, they feel they belong in contingent affiliation with life everywhere. To citizens like this, we could entrust policy-making. Our choices about education will determine whether we will have such citizens.

Footnotes

1. My colleague is Gwendolyn Thomas, who in 1972 was Assistant Professor of English at the University of Denver. She is now Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs at Metropolitan State College in Denver.

2. McIntosh, Peggy (1983). "Interactive Phases of Curricular Re-Vision: A Feminist Perspective." Working Paper #124, Wellesley, MA, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

3. McIntosh, Peggy (1988). "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to Understand Correspondences Through Work in Women's Studies." Working Paper #189, Wellesley, MA, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.